



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,284	01/23/2002	Robert H. Weiss	023070-122900US	8552

20350 7590 09/10/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

KWON, BRIAN YONG S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/056,284

Applicant(s)

WEISS ET AL.

Examiner

Brian S Kwon

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 11-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants Response to Election/Restrictions Requirement Acknowledged

1. Applicants election with N-cyclohexyl-N'-dodecyl urea ("CDU") as the elected species is acknowledged. Claims 1-5 and 11-25 read on the elected species.

Claims 6-10 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-4 and 11-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the specific derivatives of urea, carbamate or amide such as adamantly dodecyl urea, N-cyclohexyl-N'-dodecyl urea (CDU) and N, N'-dicyclohexylurea (DCU), does not reasonably provide enablement for an inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase or a derivative of a pharmacore selected from the group consisting of urea, carbamate or amide. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the

Art Unit: 1614

presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

(1) The nature of the invention:

The invention relates to a method of inhibiting the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells comprising administering an inhibitor of soluble epoxide hydrolase to said subject.

(2) The state of the prior art

The compounds of the inventions are an inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase

(3) The relative skill of those in the art

The relative skill of those in the art of pharmaceuticals is high.

(4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art

The unpredictability of the pharmaceutical art is very high. In fact, the courts have made a distinction between mechanical elements function the same in different circumstances, yielding predictable results, chemical and biological compounds often react unpredictably under different circumstances. Nationwide Chem. Corp. v. Wright, 458 F. supp. 828, 839, 192 USPQ 95, 105(M.D. Fla. 1976); Aff'd 584 F.2d 714, 200 USPQ 257 (5th Cir. 1978); In re fischer, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 10, 24(CCPA 1970). Thus, the physiological activity of a chemical or biological compound is considered to be an unpredictable art. For example, in Ex Parte Sudilovsky, the Court held that Appellant's invention directed to a method for preventing or treating a disease known as tardive dyskinesia using an angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor involved unpredictable art because it concerned the pharmaceutical activity of the compound. 21

Art Unit: 1614

USPQ2d 1702, 1704-5(BDAI 1991); In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 1557, 1562, 29 USPQ, 22 (holding that the physiological activity of compositions of adrenocorticotrophic hormones was unpredictable art; In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1577, 1562, 29 USPQ d, 1570, 1513-14 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (holding that the physiological activity of RNA viruses was unpredictable art); Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ2d 1821, 1823 (BDAI 1987); Ex Parte Singh, 17 USPQ2d 1714, 1715, 1716 (BPAI 1990). Likewise, the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of inhibiting the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells prior to filling of the instant invention was an unpredictable art.

(5) The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad due to the vast number of possible compounds of that are described as being an inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase. The breadth of claims was a factor in *Amgen v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir.), cert. Denied, 02 U.S. 856 (1991). In the *Amgen* case, the patent claims were directed to DNA sequences that encoded amino acid sequences. Because a very small change in the amino acid sequence of a protein can result in a very large change in the structure-function activity of a protein and because the laws of protein folding are in such a primitive state, predicting protein structure (and hence, activity) while knowing only the sequence of the protein is akin to predicting the weather for date in the future. (The length of the claimed peptide ranges from 7 amino acid residues to 68 amino acid residues in length. For claim 1, only 2 residues of the maximum 68 residues are disclosed. The limiting claims that limit the length of the peptide claims still claim peptides only disclose up to four amino acid residues.)

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented

Art Unit: 1614

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the degree of predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 839, 166 USPQ 24. Thus, although a single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more teaching or guidance is required. In re Fishcher, 427 F.2d 839, 166 USPQ 24; Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ 2d 1823. For example, the Federal Circuit determined that, given the unpredictability of the physiological activity of RNA viruses, a specification requires more than a general description and a single embodiment to provide an enabling disclosure for a method of protecting an organism against RNA viruses. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1562-63, 27 USPQ2d 1575. In the instant case, given the unpredictability of the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of an inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase to be effective in inhibiting vascular smooth muscle cells is insufficient for enablement. The specification provides no guidance, in the way of enablement for the entire scope of inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase other than dodecyl derivatives of urea such as adamantly dodecyl urea, N-cyclohexyl-N'-dodecyl urea (CDU) and N, N'-dicyclohexylurea (DCU). In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 27 USPQ2d 1510 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This is because it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. In re Dreschfiedl, 110 F. 2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), vies this general rule: "it is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient

Art Unit: 1614

number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combination included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result.”

The article “Broader than the Disclosure in Chemical Cases,” 31 J.P.O.S.5, by Samuel S. Levin covers this subject in detail. A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See In re Riat et al. (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; In re Barr et al. (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

(7) The presence or absence of working examples

The specification discloses inhibitors of a soluble epoxide hydrolase, namely N-cyclohexyl-N'-dodecyl urea (CDU), that are used to inhibit the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells.

In light of the results with CDU, the instant specification provides enablement for dodecyl derivatives of urea such as adamantly dodecyl urea, N-cyclohexyl-N'-dodecyl urea (CDU) and N, N'-dicyclohexylurea (DCU). However, as stated above, the specification does not provide no guidance, in the way of enablement for the entire scope of inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary

The quantity of experimentation needed to be performed by one skilled in the art is yet another factor involved in the determining whether “undue experimentation” is required to make and use the instant invention. “the test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides

Art Unit: 1614

a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed.” In re Wands, 858 F.2d 737, 8 USPQ2d 1404 (citing In re Angstadt, 537 F.2d 489, 502-04, 190 USPQ 214, 218 (CCPA 1976)). For these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue “painstaking experimentation study” to determine all of the inhibitor of a soluble epoxide hydrolase that would be enabled in this specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenquist et al. (US 6025369).

Rosenquist teaches the use of valproic acid as NMDA receptor antagonist (which is also well-known epoxide hydrolase inhibitor) for the treatment of atherosclerosis by inhibiting proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells (column 6, lines 24-41; column 12, lines 12-14; claims 1 and 12).

Although Rosenquist is silent about the property or characteristic of valproic acid as epoxide hydrolase inhibitor, such property or characteristic is deemed to be inherent to the composition containing valproic acid. Therefore, the reference anticipates the claimed invention.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammock et al. (WO 00/48593).

Art Unit: 1614

Hammock (WO 00/48593) teaches the administration of epoxide hydrolase inhibitor represented by formula I, for example N,N'-dicyclohexyl urea (Table 1 and 4), to a subject for the treatment of inflammation (i.e., adult respiratory distress syndrome, cancer), wherein said epoxide hydrolase inhibitor is administered at a total daily dose from about 0.001 $\mu\text{M/kg}$ to about 100mg/kg body weight of the mammal (claims 1, 10 and 12-15).

Although Hammock (WO 00/48593) is silent about the instant method of inhibiting the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells in a subject, such claimed method must be inherently presented in the prior art method. Especially in light of the dosage amount disclosed in the instant application (page 15, lines 14-18), the prior art method of using epoxide hydrolase inhibitor represented by formula I (i.e., N,N'-dicyclohexyl urea) for the treatment of inflammatory diseases would inherently possess the instantly claimed method when it is administered to said subject at the same dosage amount of from about 0.001 $\mu\text{M/kg}$ to about 100mg/kg body weight of the mammal as disclosed in the instant specification. Therefore the reference anticipates the claimed invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. No Claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1614

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Kwon whose telephone number is (703) 308-5377. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Brian Kwon

ZOHREH FAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600

